

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/806,706	03/23/2004	Benjamin Salvatini	8266-1268	2676
25267	7590 10/25/2004		EXAM	INER
BOSE MCKINNEY & EVANS LLP			SANTOS, R	OBERT G
135 N PENNSYLVANIA ST SUITE 2700 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3673		

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/806,706	SALVATINI ET AL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert G. Santos	3673				
- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. I the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/23. 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under Expression	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-11,13,14,16-22,25-35 and 37-4</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>5,12,15,23,24 and 36</u> is/are objected 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration. O is/are rejected. to.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Set tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application of the second in the secon	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05142004, 09212004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Day 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 4, 8-11, 16-22, 25-35, 37, 38 and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,369,828 to Graebe in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,504 to Romano et al. Graebe '828 is considered to show the limitations as recited in claims 1, 4, 8-11, 16-22, 26-35, 37, 38 and 40 (note especially Figures 1-4 & 6; column 3, lines 3-7 & 30-35; column 4, lines 9-23; column 5, lines 36-61; and column 6, lines 52-57) except for the use of a three-dimensional fiber network cooperating with the inflatable bladders and at least one foam member and being positioned within the interior region of the at least one cover. Romano et al. '504 provide the basic teaching of a support apparatus provided with a three-dimensional fiber network (60) supported by a base (10, 50) and positioned within a cover (62). The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Graebe '828 with a three-dimensional fiber network cooperating with the inflatable bladders and at least one foam member and being positioned within the interior region of the at least one cover in order to improve pressure distribution, thereby aiding in providing enhanced user comfort and support (see Romano et al. '504, column 1, lines 8-9 and column 2, lines 4-7 & 11-18). As concerns claim 25, Graebe '828, as modified by Romano et al. '504, does not specifically

Application/Control Number: 10/806,706

Art Unit: 3673

disclose the use of a second mattress section including a second plurality of inflatable bladders and a second three-dimensional fiber network enclosed within a second cover; the skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Graebe '828 with a second plurality of inflatable bladders and a second three-dimensional fiber network enclosed within a second cover since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Page 3

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 16-22, 25-35 and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being 3. unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,794,288 to Soltani et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,504 to Romano et al. Soltani et al. are considered to show the limitations as recited in claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 16-22, 25-35 and 37-40 (note especially Figures 1-5; column 5, lines 35-67; column 6; column 7, lines 1-27 & 41-67; and column 8, lines 1-23 & 32-50) except for the use of a three-dimensional fiber network cooperating with the inflatable bladders and at least one foam member and being positioned within the interior region of the at least one cover. Romano et al. '504 provide the basic teaching of a support apparatus provided with a threedimensional fiber network (60) supported by a base (10, 50) and positioned within a cover (62). The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Soltani et al. '288 with a three-dimensional fiber network cooperating with the inflatable bladders and at least one foam member and being positioned within the interior region of the at least one cover in order to improve pressure distribution, thereby aiding in providing enhanced user comfort and support (see Romano et al. '504, column 1, lines 8-9 and column 2,

Application/Control Number: 10/806,706

Art Unit: 3673

lines 4-7 & 11-18). As concerns claim 25, Soltani et al. '288, as modified by Romano et al.

Page 4

'504, do not specifically disclose the use of a second mattress section including a second

plurality of inflatable bladders and a second three-dimensional fiber network enclosed within a

second cover; the skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made

to provide the apparatus of Soltani et al. '288 with a second plurality of inflatable bladders and a

second three-dimensional fiber network enclosed within a second cover since it has been held

that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the

art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

4. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graebe '828 in

view of Romano et al. '504, and further in view of Soltani et al. '288. Graebe '828, as modified

by Romano et al. '504, does not specifically disclose the use of a cover which is configured to

permit air to pass therethrough. Soltani et al. provide the basic teaching of a support apparatus

(12) provided with a cover (24) that allows air to pass therethrough. The skilled artisan would

have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Graebe

'828, as modified by Romano et al. '504, with a cover which is configured to permit air to pass

therethrough in order to impart increased ventilation to a user positioned thereon, thereby helping

to provide further enhanced user comfort.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5, 12, 15, 23, 24 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

Art Unit: 3673

the base claim and any intervening claims. The examiner respectfully asserts that none of the prior art, taken either singly or in combination, is seen to teach or suggest the structural limitations of a plurality of inflatable bladders which is supported by at least one three-dimensional fiber network as recited in claims 5 and 12, a top portion of a plurality of inflatable bladders being formed from the top surface of the at least one cover as recited in claim 15, the bottom surface of the at least one cover including an opening configured to receive the at least one foam member as recited in claims 23 and 24, and ticking material covering the three-dimensional network and the foam support as recited in claim 36.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Flick et al. '078, Salvatini et al. '450, Romano et al. '255, Clapper '112, Reeder et al. '987, Salvatini et al. '800, Reeder et al. '935, Flick et al. '848, Clapper '080, Rowley et al. '263, Reeder et al. '503, Reeder et al. '209, Romano et al. '200, Stolpmann et al. '735, Stolpmann et al. '718, Soltani et al. '578, Graebe '238, Reeder et al. '861, Flick '855, Graebe '832, Taylor et al. '784, Miller, Sr. et al. '949, Graebe '257, Graebe '107, Graebe '741, Hannagan et al. '474, Dotson '176, Peck et al. '744 and Stracke '224.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert G. Santos whose telephone number is (703) 308-7469. The examiner can normally be reached on Tues-Fr and first Mondays, 10:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m..

Application/Control Number: 10/806,706

Art Unit: 3673

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather C. Shackelford can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert G. Santos Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3673

R.S.

October 20, 2004